

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 19 to 24, 26, 40, 46 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,991,276 (Yamamoto) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,857 (Newlin) and further in view of Japan 10-2433389 (Takeo), and Claims 25 and 27 to 30 were rejected under § 103(a) over Yamamoto in view of Newlin and Takeo and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,747 (Berry). The rejections are respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following.

Initially, Applicant notes that Takeo is effective as a reference as of its publication date of November 9, 1998. On the other hand, the present invention claims priority to Japan 10-190748, which was filed on July 6, 1998. A Claim To Priority and a certified copy of the priority document were filed in this application on December 16, 1999, the receipt of which was acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action dated September 11, 2002. Applicant is submitting herewith a sworn translation of the priority document and submits that the sworn translation is accurate. In accordance with MPEP § 201.15, the Examiner is requested to confirm for himself that Applicant is entitled to his July 6, 1998 priority date and once the Examiner is satisfied, he is respectfully requested to remove Takeo as a reference against each of the rejected claims supported by the sworn translation. Once Takeo has been removed as a reference, all of the outstanding rejections are believed to be obviated. Nonetheless, Applicant submits that the claims are believed to be allowable over the applied art for at least the following reasons.

The present invention concerns controlling communications between terminals that can communicate using moving image data and voice data (such as a

dedicated videoconferencing terminal) and terminals that communicate using still image data and text data but not voice data (such as a personal computer that uses text chat). According to the invention, first image data (such as moving image data) input to a control device from a first terminal (such as the videoconferencing terminal) that can communicate via voice data is converted into second image data for which a format of the data is adjusted (such as a conversion from moving image data to still image data) according to a second terminal (such as a PC). Voice data input from the first terminal is recognized by the control device and text data is generated therefrom. The converted second image data and the generated text data is then distributed to the second terminal. As a result, moving images and voice data input to a control device from a dedicated videoconferencing terminal are converted into still image data and text data for distribution to a personal computer so that a user of the personal computer can effectively participate in a video conference session in real time, without the need for large volume video conference hardware and software.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 19 is a data communication control apparatus for controlling distribution of data among a plurality of communication terminals connected to the control apparatus, the plurality of connected terminals including at least a first terminal which can communicate voice data to the control apparatus and a second terminal which can communicate text data but not voice data to the control apparatus, comprising an image converting device adapted to convert first image data that has been entered to the data communication control apparatus from the first terminal into second image data for which a format of the data is adjusted according to the second terminal, a voice recognition device adapted to recognize voice data that has

been entered to the data communication control apparatus from the first terminal and to generate text data based upon the recognized voice data, a control device adapted to control a way of distributing data corresponding to the plurality of connected communication terminals, and a data distributing device adapted to distribute the converted second image data and the generated text data to the second terminal.

Independent Claims 40 and 46 are method and recording medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 19. Likewise, independent Claim 48 is an apparatus claim that includes features substantially corresponding to those included in Claim 19.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention. More particularly, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a control apparatus converting first image data that has been entered to the control apparatus from a first terminal that can communicate voice data into second image data for which a format of the data is adjusted according to a second terminal that can communicate text data but not voice data, generating text data based upon recognized voice data input from the first terminal, and distributing the converted second image data and the generated text data to the second terminal.

Yamamoto is seen to disclose a video conference system that includes a plurality of video conference terminals, a video conference server and a video conference administrator. The Office Action alleges that Yamamoto's video conference server multiplexes image data and text data, and distributes the multiplexed data to a user terminal. (Column 5, lines 15 to 17.) The image data of Yamamoto includes both MPEG

video images input by a camera and JPEG images input by scanning a document on a scanner. The video and audio data is then multiplexed and transmitted to other terminals, where the data is decoded and displayed. Thus, the input image data of Yamamoto is not converted from first data to second data for which a format is adjusted according to the second terminal, but rather, it merely multiplexed with audio data without any conversion. Moreover, the Office Action admits that Yamamoto fails to disclose a voice recognition unit that recognizes voice data and that generates text data based upon the recognized voice data. While text data may be multiplexed with the video and audio data, the text data is input by a user using a keyboard and is not generated from recognized voice data. Accordingly, Yamamoto does not distribute converted image data and text data that is generated from recognized voice data to the second terminal.

Newlin is merely seen to disclose the ability to recognize voice data and to convert the recognized voice data into text data. However, like Yamamoto, Newlin is not seen to disclose or to suggest converting first image data input from a first terminal that can communicate voice data into second image data for which a format of the data is adjusted according to a second terminal that can communicate text data but not voice data.

Takeo is merely seen to disclose converting moving image data to still image data according to predetermined extraction rules. However, like Yamamoto and Newlin, Takeo is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of converting first image data input from a first terminal that can communicate voice data into second image data for which a format of the data is adjusted according to a second terminal that can communicate text data but not voice data.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of Yamamoto, Newlin and Takeo, independent Claims 19, 40, 46 and 48 are believed to be allowable.

Berry is not seen to add anything to overcome the deficiencies of Yamamoto, Newlin or Takeo and is also not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a control apparatus that converts first image data that has been entered to the control apparatus from a first terminal that can communicate voice data into second image data for which a format of the data is adjusted according to a second terminal that can communicate text data but not voice data, generates text data based upon recognized voice data input from the first terminal, and distributes the converted second image data and the generated text data to the second terminal.

Accordingly, all of Claims 19 to 30, 40, 46 and 48 are believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 82142v1